Case	3:09-cv-02775-WQH-BGS	Document 51	Filed 09/30/10	PageID.413	Page 1 of 3
1					
1					
2					
3					
4 5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10				·	
11	ezGDS, INC.,		[CAS]	E NO. 09cv27	75 WQH (NLS)
12		Plaintif			
13	vs. KAYAK SOFTWARE CO	ORPORATION			
14		Defendan			
15			_		
16	KAYAK SOFTWARE CO	ORPORATION	,		
17	VS.	Counterclaiman	t,		
18 19	ezGDS, INC., TRAVEL S CENTER , INC.	SUPPORT			
20	Cou	ntderdefendants	S		
21	KAYAK SOFTWARE CO	ORPORATION	· ,		
22		rdparty Plaintif	f,		
23	VS.	TED INC			
24	TRAVEL SUPPORT CEN		_		
25	ı nıraj	party Defendant	L.		
26	<u> </u>				
27	HAYES, Judge:				
28	On September 28, 2	010, Mintz Lev	in Cohn Ferris C	Glovsky and P	opeo P.C. ("Mint
	•			-	

- 1 -

to withdraw because ezGDS and TSC failed to pay legal fees and expenses.

2 3

Levin") filed a motion to withdraw as counsel of record for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant ezGDS, Inc. ("ezGDS") and Counterclaim Defendant Travel Support Center, Inc. ("TSC"). (ECF No. 50). According to the declaration of Susie S. Yoo, Mintz Levin moves

"An attorney may not withdraw as counsel except by leave of court." *Darby v. City of Torrance*, 810 F.Supp. 275, 276 (C.D. Cal. 1992). The decision to grant or deny counsel's motion to withdraw is discretionary. *Deal v. Countrywide Home Loans*, Case No. C 09-01643 SBA, 2010 WL 3702459, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2010) (citing *Washington v. Sherwin Real Estate, Inc.*, 694 F.2d 1081, 1087 (7th Cir. 1982). When ruling on motions to withdraw, courts consider: "(1) the reasons counsel seeks to withdraw; (2) the possible prejudice that withdrawal may cause to other litigants; (3) the harm that withdrawal might cause to the administration of justice; and (4) the extent to which withdrawal will delay resolution of the case." *Deal*, 2010 WL 3702459, at *2 (citing *CE Resource, Inc. v. Magellan Group, LLC*, Case No. 2:08-cv-02999-MCE-KJM, 2009 WL 3367489, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 14, 2009)).

After reviewing the record and the reasons for withdrawal noted by Attorney Susie S. Yoo, the Court concludes that there is good cause to grant Mintz Levin's Motion to Withdraw as Counsel. The Court further concludes that the withdrawal will not prejudice other litigants, harm the administration of justice, or unreasonably delay resolution of the case. Mintz Levin's Motion to Withdraw as Counsel is **GRANTED**.

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 83.3(k) and federal common law, a Corporation can only appear and litigate in federal court through licensed counsel. *D-Beam Ltd. Partnership v. Roller Derby Skates, Inc.*, 366 F.3d 972, 973-74 (9th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, ezGDS and TSC are **HEREBY NOTIFIED** that they have 30 days from the date this Order is filed to obtain new counsel and have counsel file a notice of appearance. The Court also notifies ezGDS and TSC that failure to obtain new counsel and have counsel file a notice of appearance, may subject ezGDS. and TSC to default proceedings. *United States v. High Country Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, 3 F.3d 1244, 1245 (9th Cir. 1993).

The Court orders Mintz Levin to mail a copy of this Order to ezGDS and TSC and file